OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

ADDRESS OF THE CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

From the Theological Instructor.

My Dear Sir.—I hope you will not think it either immodest or unjust if I ask you to publish some observations on the "Address of the Church Association," lately given in the city papers, for I find my parish inundated with copies of them and of the inflammatory sheets which the Association is painfully disseminating. The Associationists profess to be much alarmed for the safety of "Reformation principles." This is the cry with which they go to the country; and it is, indeed, sufficiently vague and sensational. What are these principles? English Churchmen have no difficulty in answering: the Prayer Book is to us the embodiment of all that we can honestly regard as Reformation principles. But multitudes who claim to be the purest Protestants disown that standard, and have, as we all know, set up very various standards of Reformation principles. So that this is mere cant, and dishonest too, as cant usually is. The irrefragable proof of it is, that many in the Church who profess to value those principles the most sincerely, are the most forward in denouncing very much of the Prayer Book, and in endeavoring to alter it—witness the Irish Church and the English Church Associationists, the parents of the Toronto weakling, and the late secession of Bishop Cummins—while those who are stigmatized as enemies of the Reformation, are well content with the Prayer Book, as it is—the deliberate, well-considered work of the Reformers, and of the English Church of later ages. Surely, with honest, thoughtful men, this fact speaks plainly enough.

The Associationists again utter the thread-bare cant of the precious boon of "an open Bible." Now, it is a well-known fact, which not a soul gainsays, that those self-styled Evangelicals look upon "Daily Prayer" in our Church as a suspicious thing, and avoid it as a pest, though the Reformers deliberately enjoined it, as the most effectual way of giving the people a really *open* Bible.

A clamorous zeal for the Reformation is not always to be identified with zeal for Christianity. For example, the late Mr. John Stuart Mill, a simple atheist, tells us that his father, who was a deliberate atheist, "taught him to take the strongest interest in the Reformation, as the great and decisive contest against priestly tyranny for liberty of thought." Here is another example from the land to which our

Associationists turn such longing eyes, the dear home of their religious affections: "The Reformation Society of Neufcastle, in Switzerland, have issued the following programme:—A Church without a Priest; religion without a catechism; worship without mysteries; morals without theology; and God without creeds," (Toronto *Globe*, 17th March, 1869.) This is unquestionably the proved logical and historical result of that barefaced Zwinglianism which our Toronto Puritans would impudently foist upon us as the faith of the English Church! The English Reformers never suffered a graver indignity and injustice than in being saddled with the unbelieving theories of Ulric Swingle.

"The Confessional," it is true, has no place in the English Church—that is, the Romish *enforced* confession, which is pronounced necessary absolutely to salvation and Church communion. Never may that system have a place in our Church! But how disingenuous and wicked to confound that with a *voluntary* confession, which our Church does not make necessary to communion or salvation, but which she clearly sanctions and recommends in certain cases. This is not "the Confessional;" but, even this liberty, Associationists would refuse. The Bishops of the English Church, pestered and badgered as they are on all sides, into saying things not always wise, have said like common sense men that this is a matter which law cannot reach—it is in the hands of the laity; they need not go to confession.

Of Private *Confession*, LUTHER says: "I had rather lose a thou. sand worlds than suffer private confession to be thrust out of the Church." And far beyond any Anglican divine is this: "Rely on the words of Jesus Christ, and be assured that God does not remit sin otherwise than by the living voice of man, as He himself has ordained it." MELANCTHON says: "It would be wicked to take away private absolution from the Church." CALVIN bids "every faithful man remember that it is *his duty* (if inwardly he be vexed and inflicted with the sense of his sins) not to neglect that remedy which is offered him by the Lord, to wit: that, for the easing of his conscience, he make private confession of his sins unto his pastor." "Nor has private absolution less efficacy or fruit where it is sought for by those who have need of this special remedy to heal their infirmity." CRANMER says: "When your sins do make you afraid and sad, then seek and desire absolution and forgiveness of your sins of the ministers which have received a commission and commandment from Christ Himself to forgive men's sins. Despise not absolution, for it is the commandment and ordinance of God." RIDLEY:—"Confession unto the ministers....indeed, I ever thought might do much good to Christ's congregation, and so I assure you, I think to this day," (from prison, the year before he was burnt). LATIMER:—"To speak of right and true confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing." "I would have them that are grieved in conscience, to go to some godly man which is able to minister God's word, and there to fetch his absolution. It were truly a thing which would do much good." JEWELL

against his Romish adversary Harding: "The Church of England hath authority this day by God's word to bind and loose as much as ever Christ gave any of His Apostles." "As for private confession, abuses and errors set apart, we condemn it not, but leave it at liberty." "We do no more mislike a private confession than a private sermon." *These are Reformation principles.*

If any one wants to see the true mind of the English Church on this subject fully stated, let him procure a ninepanny pamphlet, "Confession as taught by the Church of England, by Rev. C. N. Gray," London and Manchester.

Of the *Sacraments* in general, which our English Puritans so much disparage, the celebrated and eloquent Edward Irving says: "....that strongest hold of faith, which superstition is ever endeavouring to possess, and infidelity to undermine." "It was this article [on the Lord's Supper, in the first confession adopted and put forth by the Church of Scotland, of which he was a minister], which delivered me from the *infidelity of Evangelicalism*, which denies any gift of God in the work of Christ, or in the Sacraments, or anywhere until we experience it to be within ourselves; making God a mere promiser, until we become receivers; making His bounty and beneficence naught but words, till we make it reality by accepting thereof; in one word, making religion only subjective in the believer, and not elective in God —objective in Christ, in order that it may be subjective in the believer; a religion of moods, and not of purposes and fact; having its reality in the creature, its proposal of reality only in God."—Works, vol, i., p. 605, 6th ed. Carlile.

That the Church of England should be spoken of as *Anglo-Catholic*, is also a mark of declension from Reformation principles. But how? "We believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and are we not to believe in the *Anglican* branch of it? That would be revolt, with a vengeance. The Prayer Book has the word Catholic, an ancient and venerable word, but I never read "Protestant" in *any* authorized Formulary of our Church. And if a few fanatics among the Ritualistic party at home have abused the personal character of some of the Reformers, I don't see how that justifies the stirring up of schismatical strife in our Church in Canada. Sure, I am, that the most pronounced Protestants, as Macaulay, Hallam, and Froude, have written no complimentary words of them; but an English Churchman need be no more concerned to defend *them* than Henry the Eighth, or any Protestant Luther's allowance of concubinage to the Landgrave of Hesse, who could not be content with one wife. It is an unlawful weakening of our position as a Reformed Church, to identify our cause with the personal character of the instruments employed by the Divine Providence. I may, however, note as an instance of the inaccuracy of the writers of the Address, that it was not the *Church Times* that employed the abusive words which they quote, but Dr. Littledale, who softened the force of them by observing afterwards that he purposely used such strong language to compel attention to his statements. But what sets the com-

mon sense and the observation of the Associationists in their full light, is the following passage:—"An early morning communion paves the way for partaking of the Lord's Supper fasting; next follow an unaccustomed vestment, a novel adornment of the communion table, a turning of the back upon the congregation, an elevation of the bread and wine, the use of incense, and at length a hint of some "ineffable mystery" in the symbols selected by our blessed Lord to typify his broken body and shed blood, 'once for all,' sacrificed for us."

Bathos and folly were never more splendidly illustrated. What! after such long, wily, elaborate preparation for the mystery of iniquity, is there nothing *at length* but "a *hint* of some ineffable mystery!" O "ridiculus mus!" we have you *at length!* As if every English Churchman were not taught from his infancy in plain words and not in *hints*, that here is "an ineffable mystery"—"the Body and Blood of Christ, verily and indeed." As if the reiterated expressions of the Prayer Book did not even *hint it*—"the dignity of this holy mystery," "these holy mysteries," "a heavenly and spiritual manner," "the Body and Blood of Christ received and eaten in the Supper," &c., &c. Thank God, our Clergy and people are so far from ending with the Associationists' "lame and impotent conclusion," that they begin a long way ahead of it.

They object to *Altar*; well, then, why not use the Prayer Book word, "Holy Table," instead of "Communion Table," which the Prayer Book does not use; and why not *treat it as holy*, instead of degrading it into a receptacle of dust, rags, and other trumpery, as a certain fine carved table in Toronto is used—*testibus oculis istis meis*. In ethics, I believe, it is allowed, that the violation of a positive precept is regarded as worse than doing what is simply not forbidden. Now, at the Mecca of the Associationists, the rubric which enjoins the oblation of the elements is always disregarded, and yet they complain of "a novel adornment of the communion table." [upon which they would not bestow even a capital letter!] I was wrong about the bathos—here is a lower depth: "The offertory is converted into an offering." In the name of wonder, how is that? Was it not in the very thought of the worshippers an offering to God? Have not the English Reformers from the first Prayer Book downwards, taught us to present our alms "reverently," that "the priest shall *humbly present and place them on the Holy Table*," and then "*humbly beseech God most mercifully to accept our alms, which we offer unto His Divine Majesty?*" Yes, they remembered the angel's words to Cornelius: "Thy prayers and thine *alms* are come up for a *memorial* (sacrifice) before God." Every word is the technical language of sacrifice. These are the men who would teach their teachers! Faugh! it is simply sickening.

Our Bishop, too, is covertly assailed because he did not interfere with that latitude of dress which in this very free and semi-democratic land, our Clergy, in common with laymen, enjoy. There is, indeed, a prescribed dress for the Clergy, which may be seen in the Canons; but not one amongst us,

High Church or Low Church, observes it. Why don't the sticklers for "Reformation principles" get up a jeremiad about this? No, no! a poor cassock, prescribed in our Canons, and by the Universities to which we belong, is looked upon with a suspicious eye, as a mark of the beast. But horrors of horrors! a young Clergyman is seen at Synod with a cross dangling from his neck! And does it not find a more fitting place there, than on the bosom of a young lady in a ball-room? and yet who so fanatical as to propose her ejection therefor from a scene of gaiety? The Bishop of Lincoln, regarded by some as possessed with an anti-Roman craze, was seen last year at the Congress of the Old Catholics, with a pectoral cross, which the dignitaries of the Lutheran Church always wear If the cross is made on our brow in baptism, it is simply and unmistakably profane to be ashamed of it any where else. Here we see the germs of an inquisitorial tyranny which, had it a chance, would soon rival St. Dominic's, and which would find fagots with quite as much zeal.

Protestant zeal is appealed to with the alarming announcement that the Romish Church makes in London alone 2,000 converts per annum. The statement is derived from the "Weekly Register," a Romish paper. How readily is Romish boastfulness admitted, when it can be made use of against brethren! For my part, I would as soon believe Satan as a Romish newspaper, when it has an object to serve. But granting it true; how many heathen are there in London who, perhaps, would be all the better for being even ultra-montanes. Nay, but "seventeen out of every twenty are from Ritualistic congregations." The Ritualists deny any such leakage, and are indignant at the assertion. But grant it, and what then? The sects lose annually immense numbers, and the Methodists many thousands, the Baptists and Congregationalists notoriously. Whither do they go? There can be little doubt, they replenish superabundantly the very doubtful losses to the Romanists. And surely the Church in the City of Toronto can excellently well afford to lose the converts to Rome there—better than she can afford to lose the many families of the *elite* of society that have revolted from her communion to that newest, most radical, and most un-Christian sect in Christendom—the Plymouthists: and who have forsaken the very citadel of purity in which the Associationists are entrenched, thus shewing their appreciation of "Reformation principles."

From Mr. Homer Dixon, one of the secretaries responsible for the address, the author of an assault on "Fasting," as taught by the Church of England, which it is harder than a thousand riddles to construe—such a mass of unintelligible jargon is it—nothing wiser could be expected than this choice morsel of ecclesiastical learning, viz., that "receiving the bread on the crossed palm," (he means, on the open palm, with the hands crossed) is a "revival of mediæval corruption!" Surely such Protestants should know that the bread was not so administered at all in the middle ages, and they *might* have learned that St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Lectures, delivered in the

Church of the Holy Sepulchre, more than fifteen centuries ago, gave this identical instruction to his Catechumens.

A great aggravation of the mischiefs complained of is, that they are insinuated "with the charms of music;" Hymns Ancient and Modern are the special instance of the peccant art; Well, those hymns may be no safer than Calvinism, but they are a great deal pleasanter, and it is little wonder if they should be more popular than the Associationists'. It is time to let the wind out of the bladder which is perpetually inflated with the gaseous ignorance that faints over

> "Shall we not love thee, Mother dear,
> Whom Jesus loves so well?
> And in His temple, year by year,
> Thy joy and glory tell?"

This is supposed to be worship of the Blessed Virgin. Does any man in his sober senses believe that the people who use the *six million* copies of these hymns actually sold, worship the Blessed Virgin? May not these "accusers of the brethren" any day satisfy themselves on this point by asking a few questions in Toronto, where those hymns are extensively used?

Let us face the dread words boldly. Is there any better reason for loving any person than that Jesus loves him; and whom does he love more than His mother? Do not Protestant preachers preach continually, and Protestant people sing continually of the "joy and glory" of the Saints of God? and then why not this pre-eminent Saint, the "Mother of God?" Whatever may be thought about the fitness of this special hymn for congregational use—and I think it is fitter sor private devotional use than congregational—it certainly contains not one sentiment which any genuine believer in the Incarnation can object to. The vocative form no more implies "invocation" than does the same form in "Waft, waft, ye winds His story;" and he would be a very windy theologer who thought this a worship of the winds. Men ought to be ashamed of such silly rubbish. "A real union among Churchmen" the Associationists profess to design; but they say, "if such a union is to be efficacious," (a "real" union, one would think *is* an "efficacious" union;) "it must be aimed at, as well as carried out in the spirit of strife." Surely the particle "not" should have some place in this sentence! but the accidental omission, as we believe it must be, exactly expresses the spirit of the *Dis*-sociationists. Strife, first, last, midst, and without end, is their sole only aim and object. What has W. H. Draper done for the Church in this Diocese? With what work of piety or charity are the names of Homer Dixon and Gillespie identified? Who knows anything of them at all in connection with religion, except as stirrers up of religious strife? It is nothing but sheerest impudence that men who are notorious for their ignorance and neglect of religious studies, and who are not eminent for their practice of religious duties and virtues, should thus set themselves up as irresponsible dictators in the Church, and presume to rebuke where they would more fitly learn.

I will end by expressing the assurance that they will find "they have taken too much upon them," and will rather be classed by their fellow Churchmen with the sons of Korah, than with the Reformers. Yours,

A HIGH CHURCHMAN.

Dec. 5th, 1873.